Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 7366 Case file # 95-230616.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in a guilty plea, no transcript.

CRM 673

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fibers

Review commenced at: 10:15 AM (Time), 11/08/01 (Date)

File #: 95-230616

Laboratory #(s): 90508075

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X				
QW		X			

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: no transcript

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 90508075 Date: July 30, 1979

Laboratory Number: Date:

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician

Laboratory Number: 90508075

Initials:

Was any other material reviewed? X☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated 5-1-82

Results of Review

File #: 95-230616 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No X ☐ Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

X☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: [signature]

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-230616

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil instead of ink. Abbreviations are used that are difficult to interpret. The hairs recovered from the Q item are marked as "SFC" or "NSFC". Presumably, this means "Suitable for Comparison" and "Not Suitable for Comparison", but there is no documentation as to why these some of these hairs are not suitable. The technician does not document the recovery of hair from the Q item.

Review completed at: 10:30 AM (Time), 11/08/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.25 hr.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts — 11/08/2001

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SR